

A Tax Gimmick To Shun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., has printed in its July 22, 1963, issue an editorial elaborating on a point I made in one of my recent newsletters. This editorial is entitled "Senator THURMOND Points Out a Tax Gimmick To Shun." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR THURMOND POINTS OUT A TAX GIMMICK TO SHUN

Churches, charities, private institutions of higher learning, and such like, are the beneficiaries of generous giving. Through it they are able to maintain the vital services they render; and, justly enough, the Federal tax laws have been drawn—through the years—respectful of that generosity; yes, implementing it by provision for lawful deductions.

These laws until now also have exempted from Federal taxation the interest paid by taxpaying citizens, on their homes, or other transactions.

Under existing law, taxpayers may deduct from the amount of their income, subject to tax, all of the interest paid and the amount of contributions to churches and charities which does not exceed 30 percent of their adjusted gross income.

The Kennedy administration doesn't like that. It now proposes that only the amounts of contributions and interest which exceed 5 percent of adjusted gross income be deductible. That is its suggestion for a major change via its highly-touted tax "reform" bill.

Who would suffer under that arrangement? Well, the taxpayers, of course; and churches, charitable agencies, and other institutions deriving their support in large measure from generous contributors. It's a peculiar, yea eccentric, suggestion, on the part of an administration which proposes—on the other hand—an endlessly enlarged outlay for handouts all over the world. It is additionally peculiar, on the interest item, considering that Uncle Sam's own interest charge now runs to more than a tenth of the Kennedy-swollen budget.

Senator STROM THURMOND has put some facts in focus with the statistical explanation of what this proposal means: The non-deductibility of the "first 5 percent" includes the bulk of all contributions and interest. According to the Internal Revenue Service, based on 1963 returns, only on 19 percent of the returns filed were interest deductions in excess of this "first 5 percent" claimed. Also, only on 15 percent of returns filed were deductions for contributions in excess of this "first 5 percent" claimed.

A taxpayer who has an income of \$8,000, can now deduct all the contributions he makes up to \$2,400, and all the interest he pays. Under the Kennedy proposal, he could not deduct the first \$400 in contributions, nor the first \$400 in interest which he pays. In truth, "under this proposal, the taxpayer would not only have less incentive to make contributions to his church and charities, and to own his own home, but he would also have less money with which to do these things."

It is not enough to suggest that under these arrangements, normally, of individual responsibility the Government would just take over.

Political gimmicks are dangerous.

The House of Representatives has the constitutional authority to originate all tax legislation—responsible exclusively to the people it represents. When Congress exercises that authority * * * that assignment of trust, only then will the Nation be safe from the political idiosyncracies of the administration in power.

Kennedy Atmospheric Treaty Not the Eisenhower Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, former President Eisenhower on April 13, 1959, proposed a treaty banning atmospheric tests. Some people are arguing that this is equivalent to President Kennedy's proposal today. Nothing could be more irrational. In 1959 the Soviets clearly were behind in all phases of nuclear weapons development. Since that time they have conducted extensive series of tests, many more than the United States. It is now admitted they are ahead in high yield weapons and they claim to have solved the nuclear anti-missile problems at a time when we are unable to make such a claim. Since the Eisenhower proposal, the Soviets have made a quantum jump ahead in areas which require testing in the atmosphere for the United States to catch up. Whereas the Eisenhower proposal would have frozen the United States in a leadership position, the ultimate effect of the Kennedy proposal is to freeze the U.S.S.R. in a leadership position. This is discussed in the following article by Columnists Evans and Novak in appearing in many newspapers on August 6:

INSIDE REPORT: ROSES AND THORNS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

All is not roses for President Kennedy's test ban treaty.

Certainly the odds right now are overwhelmingly in favor of Senate ratification, but there is a thorn or two—such as former President Eisenhower's refusal to endorse the treaty.

If General Eisenhower's inner doubts were known, they would come down to this: When he proposed a noninspection atmospheric test ban on April 13, 1959, the Russians had not yet exploded their 1961-62 series of giant bombs in the high-megaton range. Furthermore, the former President would pointedly note that his 1959 proposal—which, of course, Moscow rejected—did not ban testing in outer space.

Accordingly General Eisenhower would assert that conditions are vastly different than they were in 1959.

This leads to the second thorn—the refusal of Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, senior Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, to go to Moscow for the treaty signing. He was not specifically invited. No President or Secretary of State will risk an invitation of this kind unless its acceptance is certain. HICKENLOOPER made it clear,

several weeks ago, that he would send regrets.

HICKENLOOPER's refusal tells a lot about the automatic political response of the conservative Republicans to the new treaty. At the weekly GOP policy committee luncheon last Tuesday he surprised some of his colleagues with 15 minutes of forensics in which he seemed to challenge all Republican senators (without success) to stay away from the treaty-signing ceremony. His argument: The Republican Party had an obligation to remain uncommitted until all the evidence was in.

The evidence HICKENLOOPER wants is precisely the evidence former President Eisenhower wants: How the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the scientists, and the lab men feel about the treaty. One crucial witness, for instance, will probably be Dr. John S. Foster, director of the famed Livermore Laboratories in California.

President Kennedy had a long conversation with Dr. Foster in the White House last week, exploring the black art of nuclear testing and all its ramifications. One question they discussed was what would happen if the Russians, with or without a pretext, broke the treaty and launched an immediate series of tests in the atmosphere. How much time would elapse before the United States could match the Russians and resume atmospheric testing? Six months? One year?

The Hickenlooper Republicans have no intention of committing themselves until they know whether the answers to such technical questions might give them a solid point of attack on the treaty.

Liberal Republicans condemn this as a dog-in-the-manger attitude. As one of them said: "You can't beat peace with a nothing policy." Another remarked that GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, the two Republicans who agreed to go to Moscow despite HICKENLOOPER's challenge, went not as supporters of the treaty but as witnesses to the signing.

In a purely political context, however, the correct position for the opposition party may be Hickenlooper's: Skeptical, critical, and alert for boobytraps.

The thorns are not all in the opposition party. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, also declined a proffered invitation to go to Moscow. If RUSSELL should oppose the treaty, his great influence would find allies both inside and outside the South.

These then are the reasons for the administration's elaborate pains to build an irresistible case for the treaty. In fact, some Republicans complain that their mail has "the earmarks of a propaganda campaign."

In the end, the thorns may prove no more than minor irritations, unless the Republicans are able to locate that solid point of attack. If they do not, it will be difficult to vote against the "mother and children lobby." It is not inconceivable that even Senator BARRY GOLDWATER would find it hard to vote "no" without serious damage to a Goldwater presidential candidacy.

U.S. Deal With Cuba Revealed by Representative Cramer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, my able colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], re-

cently made the startling revelation that Castro selected half of the 4,100 Cuban refugees who entered this country on the five ships which hauled the ransom goods to Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER also revealed that of the 2,000 Cuban refugees handpicked by Castro, only 20 were denied admission to this country. Neither of these statements have been denied by the State Department. Instead, the State Department pointed to Mr. CRAMER's revelation as "academic" since, according to the State Department, "all persons leaving Cuba by legal means must have an exit permit issued by the Cuban regime."

Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing admission of concessions to and deals made with Castro. It means that Castro, not the United States, dictates who enters this country from Cuba.

I share my colleague's grave concern over this clandestine deal which evidences a slipshod security check on the refugees entering this country and which adds validity to the charges that many Castro agents have entered this country as refugees.

I too am alarmed at the secret negotiations and behind-the-scene machinations that have been going on between this country and Soviet-Cuba. I believe Mr. CRAMER should be lauded for bringing this deal to light.

In line with this, I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 31, 1963, issue of the Tampa Tribune.

The editorial follows:

MORE RANSOM FOR CASTRO

The U.S. Government refuses to recognize Fidel Castro as the true ruler of Cuba, and rightly so. Diplomatic relations with Cuba were severed during the Eisenhower administration and U.S. troops were on the point of invading the island last fall when Castro permitted the establishment of Soviet nuclear missiles on his soil directed at the heart of America.

Washington has cut off virtually all trade with Cuba, frozen Cuban Government assets in this country, and has announced that it intends one day to see the island freed of communism.

Despite this, the Government seemingly continues to make under-the-table deals with Castro.

The Kennedy administration propounded the myth that it had nothing whatever to do with the blackmail scheme under which Castro was paid \$53 million worth of food and medicines in exchange for the lives of 1,100 rebels captured in the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion. Yet it is well known that New York Attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the deal, was working closely with the Government and that the Kennedy administration pressured U.S. pharmaceutical and food processing firms into contributing the ransom goods.

Now Pinellas Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER has charged, without direct denial from the State Department, that the United States acceded to Castro's demand that he be permitted to select 50 percent of the 4,100 refugees who were brought to this country on the five ships which hauled the ransom goods to Cuba.

CRAMER said the agreement supposedly was made to obtain the release of 900 American citizens in Cuba.

A State Department spokesman says the question raised by CRAMER is "academic," because all refugees brought out of Cuba must have exit permits from Castro and security

clearance by the United States. He did not specifically deny the 50-50 agreement.

"Academic?" We wonder.

The humanitarian instincts of Fidel Castro are not so acute that he was anxious to release a particular group of refugees from the rigors of his regime. While Castro may have used the agreement to export those whose property he wanted to confiscate, it can be suspected that his main motive was to slip an army of his agents into the United States, either to work against the best interest of this country or to disrupt the efforts of displaced Cubans to form an effective force for the eventual overthrow of his regime.

Congressman CRAMER says that of the thousands of refugees who came into the country under the ransom deal, only 20 were turned down or ordered to return to Cuba. The current activities of the other hundreds picked by Castro should be of more than passing interest to U.S. security forces.

Of greater concern to Congress, however, should be the question of who approved the alleged deal with Castro and why. Paying ransom in money and goods is bad enough, but paying it in license for Communist agents to enter this country by the hundreds is far worse. This is folly of such proportions as to warrant an immediate congressional inquiry.

Study the Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier properly comes to the defense of those Members of the other body who have refused to be stampeded into a premature judgment on the partial nuclear test ban treaty.

As the Courier asks: "Is Wanting To Study Treaty Wrong?" Of course it is not, and it is indeed shocking that irresponsible attacks would be made against those who merely want to scrutinize the treaty carefully before taking a stand.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the August 2 issue of the Courier:

IS WANTING TO STUDY TREATY WRONG?

The Courier believes that the test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow should be ratified. In our view, it involves no confidence in the good intent of the Russians but merely verbalizes existing areas of self-interest. The possibilities of a Soviet double-cross, while they exist, are less risky than continued contamination of the atmosphere.

But we are also shocked at the outrageous attacks being made in Iowa and elsewhere on Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN because they refused to join the group of American officials traveling to Moscow for the formal signing of the treaty. Because they don't want to be stampeded into a premature judgment on the treaty, they are being attacked as John Birchites and blind reactionaries.

This talk may be typical of political debate; but it is significant that those who protested most loudly during the McCarthy era at the labeling of "liberals" as Communists now are engaged in an equally reckless campaign to tag every conservative a John Birchite. This type of attack would be

bad enough if HICKENLOOPER and DIRKSEN had announced they would oppose the treaty. But it is almost incredible when all they have done is say they want to study it carefully before taking a stand.

Headlong and unthinking American idealism—commendable as it may be from one standpoint—has in the past led to trouble. The Washington Naval Treaty of 1922, for example, allowed Japan naval supremacy in the Pacific and, although it expired at the end of 1936, slowed American preparation for the two-ocean war which it faced in 1941. The treaty reduced the armament burden for 15 years; but it created the dangerous conception in the United States that it was safe to allow Japan naval supremacy in the Pacific as long as our total two-ocean strength was greater. World War II proved the fallacy of that concept, although the Pearl Harbor debacle intensified the disaster.

Likewise, the real danger in the test-ban treaty is not in what it accomplishes—which is very little—but in the erroneous conception of American-Soviet relations which it may create in the minds of unthinking and poorly informed citizens. The treaty only represents a small area of common interest during a period when the Communists will continue to wage war against us by all feasible means. A full Senate debate on the treaty will serve to emphasize this point and will help to put the matter in its proper context.

We suspect that HICKENLOOPER will ultimately vote for the treaty; but he wants to prevent any headlong stampede toward the public belief that American security can be protected by worthless scraps of paper. The Russians will honor the terms of the treaty only so long as they think it is in their self-interest; and it should be ratified only on this assumption.

Vocational Education Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, today over 70 million Americans are gainfully employed and how pleased we are that this country is prospering. But unfortunately there are many who are not employed and of these there are those who are not employed because they are not trained to perform the jobs which are available. The committee's report indicates that 2.6 million young people are seeking employment; that the number of older workers continues to increase; that training and retraining opportunities are needed to obtain employment.

The fact is that we have had great changes in our employment picture. It is true that once brawn and will were sufficient to insure man a place in industry. Now special skills are needed for almost any job in the plant. These skills must be developed and training is necessary. Unfortunately, funds for

strategy or capacity, while civil leaders look upon the military as a necessary evil, dangerous to freedom and only to be called on when all other means of statecraft fail. This is typified by Woodrow Wilson's remarks that soldiers should have nothing to do with boundary drawing. "It is the military who have led us from one disaster to another," he said.⁵

It should be of some concern to note here that the free city of Danzig was established by the Treaty of Versailles at which Wilson was in conspicuous attendance, and at which his military adviser, Tasker H. Bliss, was virtually disregarded. Isolated in Poland, this German city was separated from its Prussian neighbors on either side. One of the issues which sparked World War II was Germany's desire to correct this geographical and political anomaly. Having fought World War II the victorious allies similarly isolated Berlin and left it an island in a sea of Soviet controlled territory. This was where we came in with respect to Danzig, and the Berlin issue has several times put us on the brink of world war III. One can readily understand why military men would like to sit at the peace table and in the cabinets where such decisions seem to be made in a military vacuum, for it is the military who are often called upon to correct these mistakes by force of arms.

On the other side of the coin is the narrow military attitude which eschews political considerations in military decisionmaking, either as being of minor consequence or as somehow having an immoral connotation. This attitude was expressed by Payton C. March in 1919 when he pointed out that our military program "frames entirely on its merits, without any relation whatsoever to national or international politics."

It can be seen from history that a separation of military from statecraft is not a U.S. invention by any means. It was common to most western countries long before America was discovered and it has been religiously practiced ever since for various reasons. In recent times efforts have been made to achieve more coordination between political and military elements of government in order to arrive at reasonable national policies, but this effort has achieved considerably more form than substance.

PREPARING FOR A FREE CUBA: THE EDUCATION OF CUBAN REFUGEE CHILDREN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a recent speech by Mr. Manuel J. Reyes, a refugee from Cuba, concerns the education of Cuban refugee children in this country. Referring to these children, he states:

They are the representatives and the ambassadors of Cuba in exile. All they will be able to learn about democracy is what they will be able to establish later on when their country is free * * * and the more they learn, the better acquainted and prepared they will be to face the youngsters that are still in Cuba, and have not been able to see the light and the truth, and whose minds are poisoned by communism.

Mr. Reyes makes a good point. He puts on the line, Mr. President, a little of what I fear is lacking in much of the discussion about freeing Cuba; namely, how are we preparing for this inevitable day? What will replace the tyranny of the Castro regime? There are many facets to these questions, and I stake no claim on having all the answers. But certainly the training of the refugee

children is involved. I trust all of us, American citizens and Cuban exiles alike, realize fully the tremendous responsibility we have for the proper nurture of these children, especially those with parents and other close relatives remaining in Cuba. As Mr. Reyes puts it:

It is our duty to help them. They will be the leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reyes' speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY MANUEL J. REYES, LATIN AMERICAN NEWS DIRECTOR, WTVJ, MIAMI, FLA.

Just a few months ago, I had the honor to address a few words to the Spanish and Portuguese teachers of Dade and Broward Counties.

Mrs. Catherine Pacheco, president of the Spanish Teachers Association of Dade County, was present and asked me to speak to you on the same subject I spoke about at that time: "The Education of Cuban Refugee Children."

You, the teachers at school, are the continuation of the parents at home.

I believe I can talk for the thousands of refugees in these lands of freedom and would like to bring to you the real situation between Cuban parents and children, to enlighten you as to the real value of the different aspects of the difficult problems they face.

Two years ago, in a special program we broadcast on Channel 4, we exposed the plight of the Cuban children. The name of the program was "Cuba, a Lost Generation."

To start to analyze the problem, we must realize that the Cuban children are living between two nations: At school he is an American, and at home, he is a Cuban.

This could bring at any moment a psychological trauma if parents and teachers do not work together in the education of the Cuban children.

The difficult situations which the Cuban child has to go through since the time he left his country are sometimes explosive, and will probably leave unforgettable traces or marks in their minds.

They would not stay in Cuba because the strong Communist indoctrination would have made him another Communist.

Today, the Cuban youth who are growing in Cuba, are not Cuban youngsters, but Soviet youngsters.

Youngsters who have lost their smiles and the will to do so, and who have been converted into robots with their minds poisoned by Communist indoctrination. Ideas that remind us of the time of Hitler and Mussolini.

Let us talk now about the responsibility that the Cuban child has to face in order to study.

When the parents have the financial means to pay for their children's education, the child has a great obligation to study and fulfill the purpose of the sacrifice of their parents.

For the Cuban youngster, when they realize that their parents have left everything behind: loved ones, memoirs, profession, rich or poor homes * * * work or business, rich or poor, hard years of working * * * with the only purpose to stop him from falling into the paws of atheist communism and bring him to this land of freedom * * *.

For him, I repeat, the responsibility to study is a greater one. It is the same responsibility or even greater for the Cuban youngster whose parents stayed in Cuba with their heart broken by the separation of the beloved son, and sent him here to make out of him a good man for democracy.

I know, and you know, that many of these Cuban youngsters are making their best effort to study. And it is my only wish that these poor words will help to continue the actual effort you are making, to increase it, if possible, and help others to do as well as you have done.

Another fact that increases the responsibility of these Cuban boys and girls is that they were born in Cuba * * * that they are Cubans, and that the people of this great Nation have allowed them to study in their schools.

The United States is the cradle of democracy. They can take advantage of this great opportunity to study its laws, its customs and enlighten their souls with the principles of Christianity and freedom. You, the teachers are the media God has chosen to accomplish this, and help them.

They are the representatives and the ambassadors of Cuba in exile. All they will be able to learn about democracy is what they will be able to establish later on when their country is free * * * and the more they learn, the better acquainted and prepared they will be to face the youngsters that are still in Cuba and have not been able to see the light and the truth, and whose minds are poisoned by communism.

We, the elder, will only have 5, 10, or perhaps a few more years of effective production. They will have to face the Communist youngsters when the process of the liberation of Cuba is finished. It is our duty to help them. They will be the leaders of tomorrow. On their shoulders is the future responsibility to save and reconstruct, through the Christian way of democracy, the country of José Martí.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, with the energies of the Congress and the channels of mass communication focused these days almost entirely on two phases of the civil rights front—work on new legislation and the continuing protest demonstrations—I fear that one important area is often overlooked. This is the area of implementing existing public policy up and down the line.

On June 22 of this year President Kennedy issued Executive Order No. 11114 which extended the existing equal employment opportunity program to employment on construction contracts financed with the assistance of the Federal Government.

On July 9, in a unanimous declaration of policy, the joint construction activities committee of the Detroit metropolitan area endorsed the President's Executive order and announced the removal of all racial barriers from Detroit's construction industry.

This committee is composed of representatives of contractor organizations, the building trades council, local construction unions, and the joint apprenticeship committees of 18 craft unions in the Detroit area. I congratulate each and all who helped achieve this significant declaration and policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the record of the July 9 meeting of the joint construction activities committee, and an article from the Building Tradesman of July 12, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

⁵ Vagts, p. 484.

In a meeting of July 9, 1963, the joint construction activities committee of the Detroit metropolitan area has studied President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 11114, extending the authority of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and has endorsed the letter and intent of the order without reservation.

The order provides for the extension of the existing national program for nondiscrimination in employment in Government contracts for construction financed with assistance of the Federal Government.

The Detroit area committee will immediately seek the aid of local, State, and Federal agencies concerned with apprenticeship to insure entry into apprenticeship openings for qualified applicants without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

There will be affirmative action on the part of the committee and member contractors and local unions to encourage application from members of minority groups. The committee also solicits the help of interested community groups in publicizing this policy.

The committee recognizes that the acceptance and training of apprentices to fill new jobs as they are being created in accordance with national policy will implement the long-run goals of the national equal employment opportunity program. However, with expanding employment opportunities in private building and construction as well as with respect to contracts for construction financed with assistance from the Federal Government, the committee believes that action at the apprentice training level is not sufficient to implement the full letter and intent of the national policy as stated by President Kennedy. It recognizes that affirmative action must also be taken at the journeyman level where applicants meet the required qualifications. This is in full accord with point No. 1 of the public statement adopted at a June 21, 1963, meeting of the general presidents of the international unions affiliated with the building and construction trades department of the AFL-CIO.

In order to avoid discrimination, local unions will adopt the policy of accepting into membership any applicant who meets the required qualifications, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The local unions concerned will urge qualified people already working in the crafts in a nonunion status, to establish qualifications and to apply for membership.

The committee is requesting Prof. Ronald W. Haughton of Wayne State University, and a member of the academic advisory committee to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, to consult with it to establish fair and impartial procedures to implement the policies to which it has herein subscribed.

The four-point program adopted by the general presidents June 21, 1963, is to be included in the above resolution.

The following motion was also adopted unanimously:

"That the joint construction activities committee request all joint apprenticeship committees affiliated with the Construction and Allied Industries Joint Apprenticeship Council, Detroit and vicinity, to make available immediately, in writing, for all concerned the qualifications and rules regarding application for or employment of apprentices in their respective apprenticeship programs; and further, the joint construction activities committee requests the six-man executive committee of the Construction and Allied Industries Joint Apprenticeship Council to study the written qualifications and rules to determine whether any changes are necessary to insure nondiscrimination."

The above excerpts are from the special meeting of the joint construction activities committee held on Tuesday, July 9, 1963, for your information and records.

W. HARRY LANE,
Chairman.
TOM McNAMARA,
Secretary.

[From the Building Tradesman, Detroit, Mich., July 12, 1963]

CRAFTS VOW TO END ALL DISCRIMINATION

Racial discrimination in the construction industry has been all but erased following a series of meetings by leaders in the construction industry from both labor and management, public officials, apprentice heads and representatives of the Trade Union Leadership Council, a Negro group which first advanced the bias charge.

The series of sessions culminated last Tuesday with the passage of two resolutions that broke down any and all alleged barriers to full participation in the construction industry by Negro workmen, other than the usual high standards long prevalent in the industry.

The resolutions were passed at a meeting of the joint construction activities committee of the Detroit metropolitan area, which is composed of building trades union and industry leaders, and the members of all joint apprenticeship committees among the 18 craft unions.

Following the session, Tom McNamara, secretary-manager of the Detroit Building Trades Council and secretary of the joint construction activities committee, called Horace Sheffield, administrative vice president of Trade Union Leadership Council, and read to him the two resolutions and filled in with the action of the groups.

Sheffield expressed himself as pleased with both the gist of the resolutions and the unanimous passage which both received.

The series of meetings—set off by an Executive order issued by President Kennedy which banned discrimination on all construction projects that receive Federal financial aid—began with the executive board of the Detroit Building Trades Council meeting with Trade Union Leadership Council leaders.

This meeting was held June 28 after which the other meetings were scheduled.

Then Mayor Cavanagh called a meeting of construction leaders Monday. This meeting, like the others, ended on a happy note, with a pleasant discussion of ways and means of meeting the demands made by the Trade Union Leadership Council.

Meanwhile, the Detroit Building Trades Council's executive board was scheduled to meet with Trade Union Leadership Council leadership last Thursday and explain the actions taken on Tuesday. Because the Building Tradesman's press date falls on Thursday, coverage was unavailable in this edition. The joint construction activities committee meeting opened smoothly with Joe Perry, business manager of Plumbers Local 98, presenting a resolution that called for affirmative action by way of accepting apprentices and journeymen regardless of race, color, creed or national origin, provided they met the same high standards as other apprentices.

The resolution also recommended that Prof. Ronald W. Haughton, director of the Institute of Industrial and Labor Relations at Wayne State University and a member of the Academic Advisory Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, be invited to serve as consultant.

The resolution also set forth that the Detroit area committee would immediately seek the aid of local, State, and Federal agencies concerned with apprenticeship to

insure entry into apprenticeship openings of qualified applicants without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

This resolution also called for the admittance of qualified journeymen into building trades unions regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

The resolution was amended to include all 4 points of an antidiscrimination program outlined by the 18 presidents of trade unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO building and construction trades department.

The second resolution covered the apprenticeship program. It follows in full below:

"That the joint construction activities committee request all joint apprenticeship committees affiliated with the Construction and Allied Industries Joint Apprenticeship Council, Detroit and vicinity, to make available immediately, in writing, for all concerned the qualifications and rules regarding application for or employment of apprentices in their respective apprenticeship programs; and further, the joint construction activities committee requests the six-man executive committee of the Construction and Allied Industries Joint Apprenticeship Council to study the written qualifications and rules to determine whether any changes are necessary to insure nondiscrimination."

Those attending were assured by Felician Van Den Branden, principal of the Detroit Apprentice Training School, and James Whyte, field representative of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training that neither the school nor the Detroit Board of Education permitted discrimination in the apprenticeship program.

The two motions were placed under vigorous, but friendly discussion in an open attempt to iron out any and all inequities.

Various spokesmen for contractors' organizations, including Perry Schiltz, of the Detroit Electrical Contractors Association, and spokesmen for all employer organizations represented, agreed to abide by the terms of the resolutions.

Following the discussion and passage of the two motions, Louie Holmes, Jr., secretary treasurer of Laborers Local 334, and a charter member of Trade Union Leadership Council, was asked to present his opinions on what had been accomplished.

Holmes said that in the past contractors had been as guilty, if not more so, than trade unions in the practice of discrimination.

He explained that the Trade Union Leadership Council had membership in all walks of life, including a member of common council, who are interested in ending discrimination in the construction industry and elsewhere.

"We will watch the building trades closely," he said. At the same time he said that L. M. "Boots" Weir, secretary-treasurer of the Carpenters District Council, and Irving Bronson, Painters District Council business representative, had made it clear that their unions had no policy of discrimination.

"My father is a carpenter member of Weir's organization," he said. He then charged that some other unions, even outside the construction unions, did carry on a policy of discrimination.

Holmes also explained how local 334 had integrated its staff in keeping with a policy of antibias. At the same time he said, "We want action, not words."

When some building trades leaders stressed some of the difficulties they had in organizing Negro workmen, they were assured that the Trade Union Leadership Council would help them in this endeavor.

The four antidiscrimination points laid down by the 18 international union presidents and included in the first resolution follow in full below: